respect to the Upstream Facilities on an annual basis. The audit shall cover the one-year period ending one hundred eighty (180) days prior to the beginning of the period covered by the next Annual Budget and the Cost Consultant's audit report ("Audit Report") shall be provided to the City, Lockheed Martin and EPA at least one hundred fifty (150) days prior to the beginning of the period covered by the next Annual Budget. The purpose of the audit is to: (1) assist the Cost Consultant in preparing the Annual Budget; and (2) allow the parties to determine whether any unnecessary costs have been incurred.

- 4. Within sixty (60) days of receipt of an annual Audit Report, the City shall reimburse the O&M Trust Account for expenditures found to be unnecessary during the audited period.
- 5. Lockheed Martin, the City and EPA shall each have the right to invoke dispute resolution with respect to any finding in an Audit Report.
- 6. The Cost Consultant shall perform a final audit of the City's request for payments for O&M Activities with respect to the Upstream Facilities within ninety (90) days following EPA's approval of the Certificate of Completion pursuant to Section XV of this Decree. Lockheed and the City shall settle all accounts with the O&M Trust Account within thirty (30) days of the issuance of the Cost Consultant's final Audit Report. At that time, the Cost Consultant shall direct the Trustee and the Trustee shall be required to pay over all remaining funds in the O&M Trust Account, if any, to Lockheed Martin. Lockheed Martin, the City and EPA shall have the right to invoke dispute

resolution with regard to the final accounting or the final Audit Report.

- I. The City of Burbank shall utilize a competitive bidding process to secure all services and materials required to perform O&M Activities with respect to the Upstream Facilities that are susceptible to contract. Award of any contract to other than the "lowest responsible bidder" within the meaning of Burbank Municipal Code § 9-122 (Section 54 of the Charter of the City of Burbank, as amended January 14, 1971), shall require a justification by the City pursuant to applicable state and local law. Lockheed Martin hereby reserves all of its rights under state or local law concerning award of any such contract to any person or persons except the "lowest responsible bidder" within the meaning of Burbank Municipal Code § 9-122.
- J. For operation of the Upstream Facilities, the City of Burbank shall utilize the lowest cost power source available under any of the following options: (1) under ordinances or resolutions of general application adopted by the City, (2) mandated by federal law, or (3) in accordance with Public Utilities Code section 9602 or other applicable state law. Should a separate power generation facility, or any other capital improvement not integral to the Upstream Facilities, be proposed by Lockheed Martin as a capital expenditure under Paragraph K below, the city will consider such a proposal on the same fair and equitable basis as it would treat any similar proposal by any other industrial power consumer in the City. Power for operating the Upstream Facilities, when provided by the City, shall be

billed by the City of Burbank at the lowest rate then charged by the City for comparable service conditions. As of September 1, 1996, "comparable service conditions" for the Upstream Facilities are Rate Class "Industrial" and Rate Code "P." If the City adopts a rate for "comparable service conditions" other than the rate charged by the City to any public or private school, or charged to any user under an agreement entered into in conjunction with a "redevelopment project" pursuant to the California Redevelopment Act, Health & Safety Code § 33000 et seq., which provides power at lower cost than Rate Code "P," the lower rate shall apply to power sold to the Upstream Facilities.

- K. Lockheed Martin may at any time propose that a capital expenditure be incurred to reduce O&M expenditures with respect to the Upstream Facilities. Any such proposal shall be simultaneously submitted to the Cost Consultant, the City and EPA. Any such proposal shall be limited to facilities that can be fully accommodated within "Area F" (except necessary utilities) as shown on Appendix F to the First Consent Decree.
- 1. Settling Work Defendant shall have no obligation to operate any separate power generation facility. Nor shall Settling Work Defendant have any obligation to operate any capital improvement constructed pursuant to this Paragraph K, where such capital improvement is not integral to the Upstream Facilities. It shall be the obligation of Lockheed Martin to operate any such capital improvement.
- 2. A capital improvement shall be considered to be "integral to the Upstream Facilities" if such capital improvement

either (a) would effectively replace a facility or portion of a facility constructed by Lockheed Martin pursuant to the First Consent Decree, or (b) would be intrinsically linked to a facility or portion of a facility constructed by Lockheed Martin pursuant to the First Consent Decree.

- 3. The Cost Consultant shall review the proposal and any comments submitted by the City and/or the O&M Contractor, and/or EPA, and determine, based on generally accepted cost engineering principles, whether the capital expenditure is economically justified based on the size of the expenditure, the projected O&M savings and the remaining life of the project. The Cost Consultant may meet with Lockheed Martin, the City and/or the O&M Contractor, and/or EPA, with respect to the proposal and comments thereon.
- 4. If the Cost Consultant determines that the capital expenditure is economically justified, Lockheed Martin may submit the proposal and a conceptual design of the proposed work to EPA for approval. The City and/or the O&M Contractor may submit comments to EPA regarding the proposal and the conceptual design.
- 5. EPA shall review the proposal and the conceptual design, and any comments submitted by the City and/or the O&M Contractor, and determine based on relevant regulations and policies (which may include but shall not be limited to the remedy selection criteria set forth in the National Contingency Plan), whether the proposed capital expenditure may be incorporated into the remedy. EPA shall document its decision in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. EPA may meet

with Lockheed Martin and/or the City and/or the O&M Contractor with respect to the proposal and conceptual design and any comments thereon. Nothing contained in this Paragraph shall be deemed or construed to limit or abrogate in any way the City's exercise of its police powers or EPA's authority under CERCLA.

- 6. If EPA approves the conceptual design, Lockheed Martin shall submit a final design for the proposed work. If EPA approves the final design, Lockheed Martin shall proceed to implement the capital improvement. Lockheed Martin shall be solely responsible for funding and constructing the capital improvement.
- 7. Lockheed Martin shall take reasonable measures to minimize any noise and other disruptions that may be associated with the construction of any capital improvements.
- 8. Lockheed Martin shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City of Burbank with respect to actions against the City based upon disturbances related to the installation of capital improvements.
- L. With the exception of the four extraction wells (VO-1, 2, 3 and 4) located at the former Lockheed Martin Plant B-1 in Burbank, California, as depicted in Appendix 8 to this Consent Decree, both the Upstream Facilities and the Downstream Facilities shall be acknowledged by the City as its property for all purposes; provided, however, that any capital improvement constructed pursuant to Paragraph K of this Section that is not integral to the Upstream Facilities, including but not limited to any separate power generation facility, shall not be considered

or deemed to be the property of the City. Any such capital improvement shall be the property of Lockheed Martin, unless the City or a third party agrees to own the improvement. On or before the Date of Commencement, the UAO Parties, Lockheed Martin and the City shall execute appropriate writings documenting the City's ownership interest in such property. As to the extraction wells located on Lockheed Martin property, there shall be a recorded right of access.

- Commencing from the Date of Commencement, and for a period not to exceed the applicable state statutes of limitations or statutes of repose under which Lockheed Martin may bring such an action against its design contractors less sixty (60) days, the Settling Work Defendant may assert as against Lockheed Martin that any of the Upstream Facilities' failure (if any) to perform as originally designed is due to a Design Defect. Commencing upon the Effective Date of this Consent Decree (as defined in Section XXVIII), and for a period not to exceed the applicable state statutes of limitations or statutes of repose under which the UAO Parties may bring such an action against their design contractors less sixty (60) days, the Settling Work Defendant may assert as against the UAO Parties that the Blending Facility's failure (if any) to perform as originally designed is due to a Design Defect. The Parties agree that the date of substantial completion of the Upstream Facilities was March 1, 1994 and the date of the substantial completion of the Blending Facility was January 6, 1996.
 - 1. The Settling Work Defendant, Lockheed, the UAO

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Parties and EPA agree to the following procedures for the resolution of disputes arising from claims that the Upstream Facilities or the Blending Facility have failed to perform as originally designed due to a Design Defect. These disputes may include but are not limited to a determination as to whether or not a failure to perform as originally designed occurred, whether the failure (if any) was due to a Design Defect, the nature, extent and scope of the repair or other work required to cause the facility in question to meet designated operating standards, the reasonableness and necessity of the costs incurred or to be incurred for such work, and the reasonableness, necessity and timeliness of steps taken to address or mitigate such damage claims.

a. Upon the occurrence of a facility's failure to perform as originally designed which the Settling Work Defendant alleges to be due, in whole or in part, to a Design Defect in the Upstream Facilities or the Blending Facility:

causes or threatens a release of Waste Material from the Site that constitutes an emergency situation or may present an immediate threat to public health or welfare or the environment, the Settling Work Defendant shall take all actions and provide notifications required by Section XVI (Emergency Response). If the alleged occurrence or failure does not come within the provisions of Section XVI (Emergency Response), Settling Work Defendant shall immediately advise the EPA of the alleged occurrence or failure, by telephone or facsimile transmission.

written Notice of Design Defect to EPA within ten (10) days of the date when Settling Work Defendant knew, or reasonably should have known that the alleged occurrence or failure was caused by an alleged Design Defect. The written Notice of Design Defect shall include the basis for the allegation. The Settling Work Defendant shall concurrently provide a copy of the written Notice of Design Defect to either: 1) Lockheed Martin if the alleged Design Defect relates to the Upstream Facilities, or 2) the UAO Parties if the alleged Design Defect relates to the Blending Facility.

b. The Settling Work Defendant shall take such steps as EPA directs to commence repairs to the facility, and shall take reasonable steps to mitigate all damages and costs incurred as a result of the alleged Design Defect. Within five (5) days of undertaking such steps, the Settling Work Defendant shall advise EPA and all interested Parties, in writing and by facsimile transmission, of the repairs and steps it has taken or intends to undertake.

c. The Parties shall cooperate with one another and immediately make available to each other: all facilities pertaining to the failure and the alleged Design Defect; all records pertaining to the failure and the alleged Design Defect; all records pertaining to the operations and maintenance of the facility including all repair records, all work plans or designs for repair or mitigation of damages; all persons with information about the failure and the alleged Design Defect; and all systems

that are claimed to be defective. The information to be made available by the UAO Parties and Lockheed Martin shall include but shall not be limited to applicable contracts and correspondence with Lockheed Martin's or the UAO Parties' design contractors, internal documentation relating to the design of the facility with the alleged Design Defect, and "as-builts" of the facility with the alleged Design Defect. The Parties shall make good faith efforts to preserve evidence and information. The Settling Work Defendant's good faith efforts may include but shall not be limited to maintaining a videotape record or log of the status or condition of the facility prior to the performance of repairs or alterations, where practicable.

- 2. Not less than fifteen (15) nor more than thirty (30) days after receipt of the Settling Work Defendant's written Notice of Design Defect, the EPA shall make a Preliminary Finding.
- a. Lockheed Martin or the UAO Parties may submit a written or oral response to the Settling Work Defendant's allegation within the fifteen (15) days.
- b. The EPA's Preliminary Finding shall include a preliminary determination as to whether the affected facility or facilities failed to perform as originally designed; whether that failure was, in whole or in part, due to a Design Defect; a preliminary allocation of financial responsibility among the Settling Work Defendant, Lockheed Martin and the UAO Parties; and a preliminary finding as to the reasonableness and necessity of any repairs or other work done or proposed by the Settling Work

Defendant as a result of the alleged Design Defect.

 c. According to the preliminary allocation of financial responsibility in the EPA Preliminary Finding, the Settling Work Defendant, Lockheed Martin, and/or the UAO Parties shall finance the work deemed necessary by EPA to cause the affected facility to perform as originally designed, as follows.

(1) If EPA determines that the failure was caused, in whole or in part, by a Design Defect in any of the Upstream Facilities, Lockheed Martin shall, within twenty-five (25) days of receipt of the EPA Preliminary Finding, or within twenty-five (25) days of receipt of an itemized statement by the Settling Work Defendant of all repairs or other work performed or to be undertaken as a result of the alleged Design Defect, whichever is later, remit to the Settling Work Defendant the cost of all such work which Lockheed is required to finance pursuant to the preliminary allocation of financial responsibility.

(2) If EPA determines that the failure was caused, in whole or in part, by a Design Defect in the Blending Facility, the UAO Parties shall, within twenty-five (25) days of receipt of the EPA Preliminary Finding, or within twenty-five (25) days of receipt of an itemized statement by the Settling Work Defendant of all repairs or other work performed or to be undertaken as a result of the alleged Design Defect, whichever is later, remit to the Settling Work Defendant the cost of all such work which the UAO Parties are required to finance pursuant to the preliminary allocation of financial responsibility. Among the UAO Parties, the obligations of this Paragraph shall be joint

and several.

(3) If EPA determines that the failure of the affected facility was not caused, in whole or in part, by a Design Defect in the Upstream Facilities or the Blending Facility, the Settling Work Defendant and Lockheed Martin shall finance such work as these parties are required to finance pursuant to this Section, Paragraphs A-L.

- (4) The Settling Work Defendant shall use such funds as are remitted by Lockheed Martin or the UAO Parties pursuant to the Preliminary Finding to pay for work necessary to cause the facility with the alleged Design Defect to perform as originally designed and for no other purpose.
- (5) The Preliminary Finding may require a party whose facility has been determined to have a Design Defect to provide for advance or ongoing funding of any work necessary to cause the affected facility to perform as originally designed.
- (6) The Preliminary Finding also may require the Settling Work Defendant to account for expenditures of funds remitted to it under this Paragraph, and to reimburse any party who has remitted such funds if the amount remitted exceeds the expenditures necessary to perform the work necessary to cause the affected facility to perform as originally designed.
- (7) EPA shall have continuing jurisdiction over the implementation of the Preliminary Finding.
- d. Subject to EPA's approval, the Settling Work
 Defendant shall perform such work as is necessary to cause the
 affected facility to perform as originally designed. EPA may

require the Settling Work Defendant to submit a schedule and work plan for such work within a specified period of time. Such schedule(s) and work plan(s) shall be submitted, approved and implemented in accordance with Section XII (Submissions Requiring Agency Approval).

- 3. Not less than ninety (90) nor more than one hundred twenty (120) days after receipt of the Settling Work Defendant's Notice of Design Defect, the EPA shall make a further evaluation and issue a Further Determination based upon the following procedure:
- a. The Settling Work Defendant, Lockheed Martin and/or the UAO Parties, upon receipt of a copy of a Notice of Design Defect pursuant to Paragraph M.1.a.2 of this Section shall have sixty (60) days from receipt of the statement to further inspect the facilities and submit a written statement to EPA. Any such Settling Defendant may request the opportunity to make an oral presentation to the EPA by sending written notice of such intent to EPA and other, Settling Defendants who receive a copy of the Notice of Design Defect. EPA shall set a reasonable date, time and location for the presentation. The EPA, in its discretion, may require oral presentations from the affected Settling Defendants.
- b. If any party submits a written statement as described in Paragraph M.3.a of this Section, EPA shall issue a Further Determination. In the Further Determination, if any, EPA shall determine whether or not a failure to perform as originally designed occurred; whether the failure (if any) was due, in whole